

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

KHOR CHIN LIM,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

12-cv-492-bbc

SCOTT WALKER, STAPLES, INC.,
RON SARGANT, WIATR, LLC, RICKY
H. LAU, ELIZABETH LAU, YAN WAN,
LLOYD M. SMITH S.C., LLOYD M.
SMITH, MATTHEW G. PALMER,
J.B. VAN HOLLEN, FRANK H.
EASTERBROOK, WILLIAM J. BAUER,
ANN CLAIRE WILLIAMS, RUDOLPH
T. RANDA, CHARLES N. CLEVERT,
LYNN ADELMAN, YOK LAW, JOHN
REID, AMIR SAM DIBAEI, CITY OF
MILPITAS, JOSE ESTEVES, RONALD HACKER,
CVS CAREMARK, INC., LARRY J. MERLO,
SAFEWAY, INC., STEVEN BURD,
MITT ROMNEY, ED GALLARDO,
ORANGE TREE FROZEN YOGURT, AND
DOES 1 through 18, INCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

On July 25, 2012, I dismissed the complaint filed by plaintiff Khor Chin Lim for plaintiff's failure to state an actionable or non-frivolous claim arising under federal law, among other reasons. In that same order, I denied a motion to consolidate this case with several others filed by the plaintiff in this district and elsewhere. On August 9, 2012, I

denied plaintiff's motion for reconsideration and motion for my recusal. Plaintiff has filed a second motion for recusal, alleging that I am biased and prejudiced against him and should not continue to preside over his cases. He also has filed a second motion to consolidate this case with a case that I recently dismissed, Lim v. Walker, 12-cv-552-bbc (W.D. Wis.) and another case filed in the Eastern District of Wisconsin, Lim v. New York State Board of Law Examiners, 12-cv-429 (E.D. Wis.).

Plaintiff has set out many of the same arguments that I have already considered. For reasons that have been set forth previously, which will not be repeated here, plaintiff does not show that my recusal is required or that consolidation is an available option. This court does not have the time or resources to spend time on repetitive arguments such as plaintiff's when so many other litigants are awaiting the resolution of their cases. McCready v. eBay, Inc., 453 F.3d 882, 892 (7th Cir. 2006). I warned plaintiff previously in another case, Lim v. Walker, 12-cv-552-bbc (W.D. Wis. Aug. 9, 2012), that he would be sanctioned if he continued filing repetitive, meritless motions. Because he has failed to heed that warning, any future submissions that he files in this case— with the exception of a properly filed notice of appeal —will be docketed and sent to chambers for review. If his submissions seem to have any plausible merit, they will be addressed. If not, they will be denied or dismissed summarily, without opinion. Alexander v. United States, 121 F.3d 312, 315 (7th Cir. 1997).

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that

1. Plaintiff Khor Chin Lim's second motion to consolidate, dkt. #16, and second motion for recusal, dkt. #18, are DENIED.
2. With the exception of a properly filed notice of appeal, all future motions, complaints, and correspondence filed by plaintiff will be docketed and forwarded to chambers for a determination whether the matter should be denied summarily or dismissed without an opinion.

Entered this 17th day of September, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge